



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/555,076	03/02/2006	Toshiyuki Takagi	DAISAN126512	3081
26389 7590 01/19/2011 CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347				
EXAMINER BETTON, TIMOTHY E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1627				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/19/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

efiling@cojk.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/555,076 Examiner JOHANN R. RICHTER	Applicant(s) TAKAGI ET AL. Art Unit 1616
---	--	---

All Participants:

(1) JOHANN R. RICHTER.

(2) Tamara Kale.

Date of Interview: 13 January 2011

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

All

Claims discussed:

All

Prior art documents discussed:

Status of Application: _____

(3) Timothy Betton.

(4) _____

Time: 2:30pm

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Ms. Kale called to inquire as to the status of the above captioned case. She had previously requested the office action of 10/29/2010 to be vacated because it did not address her arguments filed on 5/11/2010 to the previous office action. The office agrees and a new office action which addresses applicants arguments will be mailed to applicant.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Johann R. Richter/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)